UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,058	01/10/2006	Hiroyuki Kikkoji	277517US6PCT	5748

22850 7590 10/15/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
HANCE, ROBERT J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2421	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,058	KIKKOJI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT HANCE	2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al., US Patent No 6,178,446 in view of Paul et al., US Pub No 2003/0172108 in view of Garcia, US Patent No 5,510,832 and further in view of Walker, US Patent No. 6,263,505.

As to claim 1 Gerszberg et al. disclose an information processing apparatus comprising: a transmitter configured to transmit request information, the request information requesting related information related to a content in a broadcast program being received (Abstract; col. 8 line 59 – col. 9 line 9); a receiver configured to receive the related information corresponding to the request information, and an identification code indicative of a right to receive a particular service upon purchase of a content, as a response to the transmitted request, wherein the particular service is related to the

broadcast program being received (col. 9 lines 35-58 – a subscriber receives related information and an electronic coupon. Since the coupon is electronic, it is an identification code, and coupons contain a right to receive a service upon purchase of content;); a memory configured to store the identification code which has been received (col. 9 lines 52-56); and a display configured to display the related information (Fig. 9A: 422; Fig. 1: 10).

Gerszberg et al. fail to disclose that the request information is transmitted continuously at a particular interval. However, in an analogous art, Paul et al. disclose continuously transmitting additional data requests at a particular interval (Paragraph 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Gerszberg et al. with the teachings of Paul et al. by continuously transmitting additional data requests. The rationale for this modification would have been to continually request and receive updated information from the server. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The combined system of Gerszberg and Paul fail to disclose a memory configured to store the related information, and that the display displays the related information stored in the memory. However, in an analogous art, Garcia discloses a system which receives data over a network, stores the data in a buffer, and subsequently displays the data (col. 10 line 66 to col. 11 line 6). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul with the teachings of Garcia by storing the received additional information in a buffer. The rationale for this modification would have been to buffer data as it is received, thus allowing for persistent display of the received information.

The combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia fails to disclose that the request includes at least one of a title of the content or an author of the content.

However, in an analogous art, Walker discloses a request for information related to television content that includes a title of the content being displayed (Fig. 2: 33; col. 6 lines 54-62; col. 7 lines 48-62 – the content title and a time code is used to determine what was being viewed when the user requested additional information).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia with the teachings of Walker by including a content title with the request for additional information. The rationale for this modification would have been to reduce the load on the content server by enabling it to avoid having to search a database to determine the identity of the content being viewed.

As to claims 25 and 29 see similar rejection of claim 1. The method of claim 25 and the program of claim 29 correspond to the apparatus of claim 1. Therefore claims 25 and 29 have been analyzed and rejected.

3. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al. in view of Garcia, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al., US Pub No 2002/0026419.

As to claim 2 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit the identification code together with purchase request information requesting purchase of a content, and the receiver is configured to receive content data corresponding to the purchase request information, as well as additional data corresponding to the identification code.

However, in an analogous art, Maritzen et al. disclose a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, and that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase (Paragraph 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia with the teachings of Maritzen by transmitting coupons with purchase requests and subsequently receiving the purchased content as well as a clipped coupon (i.e. additional data corresponding to the identification code). The rationale for this modification would have been to enable viewers to instantly purchase items, receive a discount on those items, and to enable servers to "clip" the coupons for limited use during subsequent transactions. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known

methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 3 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit user identification information to identify a user (Gerszberg col. 8 lines 33-36).

The combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia fail to disclose transmitting purchase request information requesting purchase of a content and the identification code. However, in an analogous art, Maritzen et al. disclose a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, and that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase (Paragraph 61).

4. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al. in view of Garcia, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leonard et al., US Pub No 2002/0046109.

As to claim 4 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia fails to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the receiver is configure to receive plural identification codes each being the identification code, and the transmitter is configured to transmit purchase request information requesting purchase of a content, and the plural identification codes.

However, in an analogous art, Leonard et al. disclose applying a plurality of e-coupons to a single purchase (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia with the teachings of Leonard et al. by receiving plural coupons from the server and transmitting these plural coupons with a purchase request. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable subscribers to benefit from larger discounts on purchases. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 5 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia and Leonard disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 4, wherein the plural identification codes transmitted by the transmitter are those that can be used for a purpose of purchase indicated by the purchase request information, among the plural identification codes received by the receiver (Leonard Abstract).

5. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al. in view of Garcia, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al., US Pub No 2002/0026419 in view of Giuliani et al., US Patent No 5,974,399.

As to claim 6 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia fails to disclose that, in response to an instruction to purchase the arbitrary content, the transmitter is configured to transmit the identification code indicative of a right to receive

a particular service together with purchase request information requesting purchase of the arbitrary content, and the receiver is configured to receive content data corresponding to the purchase request information.

However, in an analogous art, Maritzen et al. disclose a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, and that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase (Paragraph 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Garcia with the teachings of Maritzen by transmitting coupons with purchase requests and subsequently receiving the purchased content as well as a clipped coupon (i.e. additional data corresponding to the identification code). The rationale for this modification would have been to enable viewers to instantly purchase items, receive a discount on those items, and to enable servers to "clip" the coupons for limited use during subsequent transactions.

The combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Garcia and Maritzen fail to disclose that the receiver is configured to receive a second identification code indicative of a right to allow the user to receive a particular service when the user further purchases a content.

However, in an analogous art, Giuliani et al. disclose that receiving a coupon upon purchasing a particular item was known in the art at the time of the invention (col. 1 lines 29-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia and Maritzen with the teachings of Giuliani et al. by supplying a subscriber with a second coupon upon purchase of an item. The rationale for this modification would have been to entice a subscriber to make further purchases, possibly of related items.

As to claim 7 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the receiver is configured to receive the content data, the second identification code, and additional data corresponding to the first identification code (Maritzen Paragraph 61 discloses a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, and that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase); receiving a second identification code (Giuliani et al. col. 1 lines 29-35).

As to claim 8 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit user identification information to identify the user. (Gerszberg col. 8 lines 33-36); the transmitter is configured to transmit the purchase request information and the first identification code (Maritzen Paragraph 61 – coupons are used to purchase content, thus coupons and purchase requests are transmitted).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Leonard et al., US Pub No 2002/0046109.

As to claim 9 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit the first identification codes, and the receiver is configured to receive the content data, the second identification code, and additional data corresponding to the first identification code (Maritzen Paragraph 61; Giuliani col. 1 lines 29-35).

The combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose a plurality of identification codes.

However, in an analogous art, Leonard et al. disclose applying a plurality of e-coupons to a single purchase (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Garcia, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Leonard et al. by receiving plural coupons from the server, transmitting these plural coupons with a purchase request, and clipping these plural coupons. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable subscribers to benefit from larger discounts on purchases. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

7. Claims 10, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al., US Patent No 6,178,446 in view of Paul et al., US Pub No 2003/0172108 and further in view of Walker.

As to claim 10 Gerszberg et al. disclose an information processing apparatus comprising: a memory configured to store related information related to a content in a broadcast program received by a communication device (Fig. 6: 256; col. 8 lines 15-22); a receiver configured to receive request information requesting the related information from the communication device (Fig. 6: 254; col. 8 lines 15-33; col. 9 lines 10-52), and

a transmitter configured to transmit the related information to the communication device in response to the request information received by the receiver (Fig. 6: 258; col. 9 lines 10-52), and transmitting an identification code indicative of a right to allow a user of the communication device to receive a particular service when the user purchases a content, wherein the particular service is related to the broadcast program received by the communication device (col. 9 lines 50-55 – server sends users a coupon, i.e. an identification code indicative of a right to receive a particular service when the user purchases a content).

Gerszberg et al. fail to disclose that the request information is transmitted continuously at a particular interval.

However, in an analogous art, Paul et al. disclose continuously transmitting additional data requests at a particular interval (Paragraph 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Gerszberg et al. with the teachings of Paul et al. by

continuously transmitting additional data requests. The rationale for this modification would have been to continually request and receive updated information from the server. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The combined system of Gerszberg and Paul fails to disclose that the request includes at least one of a title of the content or an author of the content.

However, in an analogous art, Walker discloses a request for information related to television content that includes a title of the content being displayed (Fig. 2: 33; col. 6 lines 54-62; col. 7 lines 48-62 – the content title and a time code is used to determine what was being viewed when the user requested additional information).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul with the teachings of Walker by including a content title with the request for additional information. The rationale for this modification would have been to reduce the load on the content server by enabling it to avoid having to search a database to determine the identity of the content being viewed.

As to claims 26 and 30 see similar rejection of claim 10. The method of claim 26 and the program of claim 30 correspond to the apparatus of claim 10. Therefore claims 26 and 30 have been analyzed and rejected.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Pocock et al., US Patent No 5,014,125.

As to claim 11 the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 10, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit one identical identification code as the identification code during a particular time band.

However, in an analogous art, Pocock et al. disclose transmitting coupons to viewers who are watching a particular commercial, where the coupon offers a discount on the product being advertised (col. 17 lines 3-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul with the teachings of Pocock et al. by providing coupons that relate to products being advertised, thus transmitting one identical coupon (i.e. identification code) during a particular time band (i.e. the time during which the commercial is being broadcast). The rationale for this modification would have been to provide users with relevant coupons in order to entice them to purchase the advertised product. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

9. Claims 12, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al., US Pub No 2002/0026419.

As to claim 12 the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 10, wherein the receiver is configured to receive user identification information, from the communication device (Gerszberg col. 8 lines 33-36).

The combined system of Gerszberg and Paul fail to disclose that the apparatus receives purchase request information requesting purchase of a content and the identification code, and that the transmitter is configured to transmit content data corresponding to the purchase request information, and additional data corresponding to the identification code, to the communication device, and the information processing apparatus further comprises management unit configured to manage transmission of the additional data by the transmitter, for every item of the user identification information.

However, in an analogous art, Maritzen et al. disclose a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase, and that a server manages the clipping and transmission of individual viewer's coupons (i.e. for every item of the user identification information) (Paragraph 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul with the teachings of Maritzen by transmitting coupons with purchase requests and subsequently receiving the purchased content as well as a clipped coupon (i.e. additional data corresponding to the identification code), and to manage the clipping and transmission of the coupons on a server apparatus. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable viewers to instantly purchase items, receive a discount on those items, and to enable servers to "clip" the coupons for limited use during subsequent transactions

As to claim 15 The combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Maritzen disclose that the transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data concerning the service provided by use of the service provider identification information (Maritzen Paragraph 61 - coupons are "clipped" after a purchase, i.e. supplied with additional data concerning the service provided by use of service provider information).

The combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Maritzen fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 12, wherein the identification code includes service provider identification information to identify a service provider who provides a particular service when the user purchases a content, and transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data concerning the service provided by use of the service provider identification information.

However, Examiner takes official notice of the fact that identification codes which include service provider identification information to identify a service provider who provides a particular service when the user purchases a content (in other words, a

coupon which identifies the company and product for which the discount can be received) was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Maritzen by including service provider information that identifies a service provider who provides a particular service. The rationale for this modification would have been to allow a user to know where the coupon could be used, and for which products the discount could be received. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al. in view of Maritzen et al., as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Leonard et al., US Pub No 2002/0046109.

As to claim 13 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Maritzen fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 12, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data, corresponding to the number of identification codes each being the identification code.

However, in an analogous art, Leonard et al. disclose applying a plurality of e-coupons to a single purchase (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Maritzen with the teachings of Leonard et al. by receiving plural coupons from the server, transmitting these plural coupons with a purchase request, and to have the server clip each of the plurality of coupons, thus transmitting additional data corresponding to the number of coupons received. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable subscribers to benefit from larger discounts on purchases. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al. in view of Maritzen et al., as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Holman, US Patent No 5,287,181.

As to claim 14 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Maritzen fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 12, wherein the identification code includes information indicative of an expiration limit, and the transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data, corresponding to the identification code which has not expired yet.

However, in an analogous art, Holman discloses electronic coupons which contain expiration dates (fig. 5: 252 and 270; col. 14 lines 35-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul and Maritzen with the teachings of Holman by including expiration dates in the coupons. The rationale for this modification would have been to limit the time frames in which coupons can be used, thus making the promotion valid for a certain period only. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

the combined system of Gerszberg Paul, Maritzen and Holman fail to disclose that the transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data, corresponding to the identification code which has not expired yet.

However, examiner takes official notice of the fact that only transmitting coupons which have not yet expired was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg Paul, Maritzen and Holman by only transmitting unexpired coupons. The rationale for this modification would have been to ensure that viewers only receive coupons which can be used. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

12. Claims 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Paul et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Maritzen et al., US Pub No 2002/0026419 in view of Giuliani et al., US Patent No 5,974,399.

As to claim 16 the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 10, wherein when a user who receives the broadcast program purchases an arbitrary content, the transmitter is configured to transmit a first identification code indicative of a right to allow the user to receive a particular service together with the related information corresponding to the request information (Gerszberg Fig. 6: 258; col. 9 lines 10-52; col. 9 lines 50-55 – server sends users a coupon, i.e. an identification code indicative of a right to receive a particular service when the user purchases a content).

The combined system of Gerszberg and Paul fail to disclose that the receiver is configured to receive the first identification code together with purchase request information requesting purchase of the arbitrary content, and the transmitter is configured to transmit, together with content data corresponding to the purchase request information, a second identification code indicative of a right to allow the user to receive a particular service when the user further purchase a content.

However, in an analogous art, Maritzen et al. disclose a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, and that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase (Paragraph 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg and Paul with the teachings of Maritzen by receiving coupons along with purchase requests, and sending the purchased content to the user. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable viewers to instantly purchase items for which they have seen advertisements and requested additional information.

The combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Maritzen fail to disclose that the transmitter is configured to transmit a second identification code indicative of a right to allow the user to receive a particular service when the user further purchase a content.

However, in an analogous art, Giuliani et al. disclose that receiving a coupon upon purchasing a particular item was known in the art at the time of the invention (col. 1 lines 29-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg Paul and Maritzen with the teachings of Giuliani et al. by supplying a subscriber with a second coupon upon purchase of an item. The rationale for this modification would have been to entice a subscriber to make further purchases, possibly of related items. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 18 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the receiver is configured to receive the user identification information to identify the user (Gerszberg col. 8 lines 33-36); and that the transmitter is configured to transmit the content data and additional data corresponding to the first identification code, and the information processing apparatus further comprises management unit configured to manage transmission of the additional data by the transmitter, for every item of the user identification information (Maritzen Paragraph 61 discloses a system where television viewers can utilize a digital coupon to receive a discount on purchases, that these coupons are "clipped" after a purchase, and that a server manages the clipping and transmission of individual viewer's coupons (i.e. for every item of the user identification information)).

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Pocock et al., US Patent No 5,014,125.

As to claim 17 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit one identical first identification code as the first identification code during a particular time band.

However, in an analogous art, Pocock et al. disclose transmitting coupons to viewers who are watching a particular commercial, where the coupon offers a discount on the product being advertised (col. 17 lines 3-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Pocock et al. by providing coupons that relate to products being advertised, thus transmitting one identical coupon (i.e. identification code) during a particular time band (i.e. the time during which the commercial is being broadcast). The rationale for this modification would have been to provide users with relevant coupons in order to entice them to purchase the advertised product. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

14. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Leonard et al., US Pub No 2002/0046109.

As to claim 19 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 18, wherein the transmitter is configured to transmit the additional data, corresponding to the number of first identification codes each being the first identification code.

However, in an analogous art, Leonard et al. disclose applying a plurality of e-coupons to a single purchase (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Leonard et al. by receiving plural coupons from the user with a purchase request and to clip each of the plurality of coupons, thus transmitting additional data corresponding to the number of coupons received. The rationale for this modification would have been to enable subscribers to benefit from larger discounts on purchases.

15. Claims 20, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Holman, US Patent No 5,287,181.

As to claim 20 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fails to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the first identification code includes information indicative of an expiration limit.

However, in an analogous art, Holman discloses electronic coupons which contain expiration dates (fig. 5: 252 and 270; col. 14 lines 35-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Holman by including expiration dates in the coupons. The rationale for this modification would have been to limit the time frames in which coupons can be

used, thus making the promotion valid for a certain period only. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 21 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the first identification code includes service provider identification information to identify a service provider who provides a particular service when the user purchases a content.

However, Examiner takes official notice of the fact that identification codes which include service provider identification information to identify a service provider who provides a particular service when the user purchases a content (in other words, a coupon which identifies the company and product for which the discount can be received) was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani by including service provider information that identifies a service provider who provides a particular service. The rationale for this modification would have been to allow a user to know where the coupon could be used, and for which products the discount could be received.

As to claim 23 combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 21, wherein the

second identification code includes service provider identification information different from the service provider identification information.

However, Examiner takes official notice of the fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this second coupon could be for another product, from another service provider, and thus would have service provider identification information that is different from the first identification code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani by having the second identification code (coupon) be for another service provider. The rationale for this modification would have been to allow for vendors to offer discounts on a wide variety of products, instead of only those products from a single service provider.

16. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Von Kohorn, US Patent No 5,128,752.

As to claim 22 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 21, wherein the first identification code is authenticated based on the service provider identification information.

However, in an analogous art, Von Kohorn discloses authenticating coupons based on redemption information contained therein (claim 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Von Kohorn by authenticating the coupons based on service provider identification information (which is a type of coupon redemption information). The rationale for this modification would have been to ensure that coupons are not forged. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

17. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Maeda, US Pub No 20030003431.

As to claim 24 the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani fail to disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the second identification code is a dummy track.

However, Maeda discloses storing data in a music track (i.e. a dummy track) (Paragraph 104).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Gerszberg, Paul, Maritzen and Giuliani with the teachings of Maeda by storing coupon information in a dummy track. The rationale for this modification would have been to place the coupons in an existing data file (i.e. a

music track). All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT HANCE whose telephone number is (571)270-5319. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

ROBERT HANCE
Examiner
Art Unit 2421

/ROBERT HANCE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421